REV 44

DOCUMENT CONTROL SYSTEM - CORRESPONDENCE FILE

Document Number: 82181

WELDON SPRING SITE REMEDIAL ACTION PROJECT
MK-FERGUSON CO., INC. WO 3589 (314) 441-8086
7295 Highway 94 South
St. Charles, MO 63304

▸▸Document Type: LR-DOEW-WSCC

Originators DCN: _____

▸SUBJECT LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL RE: POST-CLEANUP EVALUATION FOR THE SOUTHEAST DRAINAGE

▸▸AUTHOR PAULING, T. ▸▸TO HACHEY, G. ▸▸DATE 02/22/99

▸SUBJECT CODE/WORK PACKAGE NUMBER 01170

REFERENCED DOCUMENT(S) _____

ACTION ITEM TRACKING

INITIATE ACTION ITEM

INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNED TO ACTION _____ DEPARTMENT _____

ACTION REQUIRED _____

DUE DATE / / _____ ACTION ITEM LOG NUMBER _____

CLOSE ACTION ITEM

ACTION ITEM LOG NUMBER _____ INITIATING DOCUMENT DIN _____

COMPLETION DATE _____ APPROVAL _____

COMMENTS _____

DISTRIBUTION	ATTACH W	ATTACH W/O	APPRVL. ROUTE ORDER	APPRVL. INITIAL
D.E. STEPPEN				
K.M. GREENWELL				
S.D. WARREN				
C.A. COONEY				
J. HEITKAMP				
D.K. MURANO				
P.D. CAGE				
D.E. HOFFMAN				
W.W. JOHNSON				
G.E. MCKAY				
D.S. HIXSON				
M. MITCHELL				
P.J. PINCH				
C.R. SAVAGE				
D.C. WIGTON				
M.L. WESELY				

DISTRIBUTION	ATTACH W	ATTACH W/O	APPRVL. ROUTE ORDER	APPRVL. INITIAL
S.D. ANDERSON				
G.L. VALETT				
S.L. HODGES				
DOCUMENT CONTROL:				
CORRESPONDENCE FILE	X			
WORK PACKAGE FILE				
TECH EDITOR				
ORIGINATOR:				

DISTRIBUTION	W	W/O
DOE		
S.E. MCCRACKEN		
G.A. NEWTOWN		
P.S. THOMPSON		
J.R. ENRIGHT		
K.A. REED		
T.C. PAULING		
A.D. PICKETT		
SAI		
M.B. BALLEW		
S. RICHARDSON		
Y. OBYO		
W.R. OWEN		
J. MARTIN		

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
WELDON SPRING SITE
REMEDIAL
ACTION PROJECT
7295 Hwy. 94 South
St. Charles, Mo. 63304
(314) 441-8086 Fax: (314) 447-0803

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DATE: 02/22/99

ATTENTION: Glen Hachey

RE: Post-Cleanup Evaluation for the Southeast Drainage

TO: Weldon Spring Citizens Commission

WE ARE SENDING YOU Attached Under separate cover via _____ the following items:

Subcontract Submittals
Shop drawings Prints Plans Specifications
Subcontract Modifications

COPIES	DATE	NO.	DESCRIPTION
1	02/12/99		Post-Cleanup Evaluation for the Southeast Drainage

THESE ARE TRANSMITTED as checked below:

For review only
For review and comment
As requested
Other _____

Remarks: FYI – Please contact either myself at (314)926-7051 or Yvonne Deyo, PAI Corporation at (314)926-7034.

Copy to: Helene Diller, WSCC

Signed: _____
(DOE Project Engineer)

If attachments are not as noted, kindly notify us at once.

Copy w/o attachment:

E. Heuer/G. Burkhart, PAI

Q:usdoelot.frm

Department of Energy
Oak Ridge Operations
Weldon Spring Site
Remedial Action Project Office
7295 Highway 94 South
St. Charles, Missouri 63304

82181

February 12, 1999

Mr. Dan Wall
Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. EPA
Region VII
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Dear Mr. Wall:

POST-CLEANUP EVALUATION FOR THE SOUTHEAST DRAINAGE

Remediation in the Southeast Drainage was completed in February 1998. The November, 1996 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Decision Document approved for the project stated that achieving risk reduction in all segments of the drainage was the basis for cleanup. Samples were taken as specified in the Post Remediation Sampling Plan for the Southeast Drainage. Results were analyzed by Argonne National Lab and risk reduction was calculated (see attached). Results indicate that risk was reduced in all segments of the drainage, thereby fulfilling the goal of the EE/CA Decision Document.

Although overall post remediation sample results indicate cleanup goals were achieved, two locations (#60 and #101) with anomalous results have been evaluated for an additional limited removal effort. A total of approximately 10 cubic yards of soil is targeted for removal from both areas. A small backhoe would likely be utilized to excavate each area and tram the soil to a dump truck. It is expected that three truckloads of soil would be hauled out of the drainage area. Minimal impact to the drainage would result and it would be returned to its current condition. Use of the Katy Trail would be minimal. Following this limited removal effort, samples will be taken and analyzed to document the final concentrations at these locations. We intend to perform this work as soon as possible and expect that it will require less than one week in the field. Issues associated with Katy Trail access are being worked directly with MDNR-Parks.

Pending resolution of any issues, we expect to proceed expeditiously. If you have any questions, contact Tom Pauling at (314)441-8978.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. McCracken
Project Manager
Weldon Spring Site
Remedial Action Project

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
Larry Erickson, MDNR
MDNR Field Office
Mike Schroer, MDC

cc w/o enclosure:
Gene Valett, PMC
Mary Picel, ANL

ATTACHMENT: POST-CLEANUP RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE SOUTHEAST DRAINAGE

This attachment presents the results of the post-cleanup risk assessment performed for the Southeast drainage. The purpose of the assessment was to determine the amount of risk reduction achieved by the removal action.

Risk calculations were performed using the same methodology as used in the EE/CA (DOE 1996). Risks were estimated for the current hunter and future child scenarios. The exposure routes evaluated include incidental ingestion of sediment and external irradiation. Risk reduction achieved at specific locations is presented in Table 1. Risk estimates for the child scenario for all locations targeted in the EE/CA are shown. Seventeen additional locations were also cleaned up in the lower portion of Segment C and upper portion of Segment D because these locations were determined to be accessible during the planning stages of the removal action. These additional locations are indicated with an asterisk (*). Exposure point concentrations used to calculate potential post-cleanup risks were those obtained after removal was completed. Post-cleanup concentrations for each radionuclide at the various locations are shown in Table 1. At locations where more than one sample was taken, the data for each radionuclide were averaged.

Table 1. Location Specific Risk Estimates for the Child Scenario

	Exposure Point Concentration (pCi/g)				Cumulative Risk	
Location ID	Ra-226	Ra-228	Th-230	U-238	Baseline*	Post-Cleanup
001	12	1.7	4.7	38	9×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
005	4.7	2.9	23	11	2×10^{-4}	7×10^{-6}
012	1.7	1.1	2.2	ND	4×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
025	15	1.3	21	74	3×10^{-4}	3×10^{-5}
027*	23	6.6	15	27	2×10^{-4}	2×10^{-5}
028	11	ND	3.2	3.7	3×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
055	4.3	0.99	5.6	8.8	2×10^{-5}	5×10^{-6}
058	5	1.2	2.9	5.0	5×10^{-5}	5×10^{-6}
059	4.9	ND	46	10	5×10^{-5}	6×10^{-6}
060	120	17	2,500	79	5×10^{-3}	2×10^{-4}
061	27	0.99	18	70	8×10^{-5}	3×10^{-5}
062	1.3	1.1	1.3	ND	1×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
063	11	ND	3.2	6.1	5×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
064	2.9	1.3	4.7	10	2×10^{-5}	4×10^{-6}
065	12	2.6	29	30	6×10^{-5}	2×10^{-5}
066*	10	1.5	70	16	5×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
067*	1.5	1.2	1.3	ND	3×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
068*	1.5	1.2	1.3	2.1	9×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
072	11	1.8	16	18	1×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
092	5.4	1.5	38	80	2×10^{-5}	9×10^{-6}

	Exposure Point Concentration (pCi/g)				Cumulative Risk	
Location ID	Ra-226	Ra-228	Th-230	U-238	Baseline[a]	Post-Cleanup
093	1.9	1.2	0.76	76	2×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
094	3.8	1.2	8.9	17	1×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
098	2.5	1.1	3.7	2.5	3×10^{-4}	3×10^{-6}
099	2.5	1.2	2.5	3.0	5×10^{-5}	3×10^{-6}
101	89	6.8	1,900	19	2×10^{-4}	1×10^{-5}
102.1	1.4	1.4	1.6	ND	9×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
102	2.8	1.3	6.4	9.9	2×10^{-3}	4×10^{-6}
103	1.3	0.77	1.5	ND	4×10^{-5}	2×10^{-6}
104	4.1	1.1	9.4	11	1×10^{-4}	6×10^{-6}
105	16	0.82	3.4	29	3×10^{-3}	1×10^{-5}
106	1.3	1.3	1.3	ND	6×10^{-6}	2×10^{-6}
107*	34	1.8	45	40	4×10^{-3}	3×10^{-5}
108.1*	7.1	0.98	3.3	9.6	3×10^{-3}	7×10^{-6}
108*	5.3	1.1	4.7	11	2×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
110*	4.3	1.1	2.9	24	3×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
110.1*	1.8	ND	2.1	5.6	1×10^{-3}	3×10^{-6}
111*	4.6	1.2	22	29	4×10^{-3}	9×10^{-6}
112*	11	ND	10	9.1	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-5}
113*	36	0.96	11	11	6×10^{-3}	3×10^{-5}
114*	2.7	1.0	2.0	6.1	2×10^{-3}	3×10^{-6}
115*	4.6	0.93	7.3	7.3	5×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
116*	2.2	1.4	1.8	5.3	2×10^{-3}	3×10^{-6}
117*	9.4	1.6	12	10	9×10^{-3}	9×10^{-6}
118*	17	6.7	60	70	2×10^{-3}	2×10^{-6}
119	1.5	0.99	0.69	11	2×10^{-3}	2×10^{-6}
120	8.8	0.62	2.4	ND	1×10^{-4}	8×10^{-6}
121	15	1.1	7.8	11	2×10^{-3}	1×10^{-5}
122	1.7	1.4	1.1	2.7	3×10^{-3}	2×10^{-6}
123	5.0	1.1	7.1	3.8	5×10^{-3}	5×10^{-6}
124	6.7	1.6	12	9.4	1×10^{-4}	7×10^{-6}
132	65	ND	120	15	1×10^{-4}	6×10^{-5}
141	2.1	0.92	4.9	2.9	5×10^{-3}	2×10^{-6}
149	10	1.4	18	34	2×10^{-3}	1×10^{-5}
153	7.3	1.2	3.5	6.4	9×10^{-4}	7×10^{-6}
154	5.1	1.7	8.6	8.3	5×10^{-4}	5×10^{-6}

a Based on pre-removal data as presented in the EE/CA (DOE 1996).

Additional calculations were also performed to show risk reduction achieved for each segment. Exposure point concentrations for sediment were calculated for each exposure unit (i.e., segment) by using the one-tailed 95% upper confidence limit of the arithmetic average (UCL) or the maximum, whichever was lower (per EPA guidance). Post-cleanup data for each segment were aggregated with data from locations in each segment that were not targeted for cleanup. (Note that some locations that were not targeted for cleanup because they are not accessible have contaminant concentrations that exceed risk-based cleanup criteria). At locations where more than one sample was

collected, the data were averaged to obtain a representative concentrations for that location prior to aggregating the data for each segment. A summary of the data used in the risk calculations is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Residual Contamination in the Southeast Drainage

Radionuclide	Radionuclide Concentration (pCi/g)							
	Segment A		Segment B		Segment C		Segment D	
	Range	UCL	Range	UCL	Range	UCL	Range	UCL
Radium-226	1.3-39	23	1.2-110	40	1.1-36	12	1.1-120	19
Radium-228	0.64-5.0	2.3	0.74-6.8	2.7	0.77-6.6	2.0	0.62-86	7.4
Thorium-230	0.20-38	18	0.27-1,900	370	1.3-45	12	0.69-2,500	180
Uranium-238	11-200	77	2.5-59	30	1.3-74	22	2.0-200	34

Results of the post-cleanup risk calculations for each segment are presented in Table 3. For comparison purposes, baseline risk calculations are also shown. Significant risk reduction (i.e., 40% or higher) was achieved for each segment with the highest amount of reduction observed in Segment C (i.e., 90%). The added risk reduction achieved in Segment C from removal of 14 additional locations not originally targeted in the EE/CA reduced the residual risk from 4×10^{-5} to 1×10^{-5}. Additional removal of three locations in Segment D did not result in further risk reduction in this segment.

Table 3: Estimated Risk Reduction from Exposure to Sediment

Segment	Hunter		Child	
	Baseline	Post-Cleanup	Baseline	Post-Cleanup
A	1×10^{-5}	5×10^{-6}	5×10^{-5}	2×10^{-5}
B	2×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}	1×10^{-4}	5×10^{-5}
C	2×10^{-5}	3×10^{-6}	9×10^{-5}	1×10^{-5}
D	1×10^{-5}	5×10^{-6}	5×10^{-5}	3×10^{-5}